



## **MAP Team Early project Coordination Meeting Response Letter Process and Format**

The following guidance is intended to help make our MAP Team Early Project Coordination EPC Response Letters more efficient and effective and to clarify roles and responsibilities and response periods. This process is intended to identify individuals responsible for the first line of editing for their agency. The draft EPC letter would then be circulated to the rest of the team and edited as has previously occurred. After editing, the letter and any attachments will be sent to the PEC.

1. Each Agency will have an individual responsible for collecting, formatting, and editing their agency comments so that they can be “dropped” into the EPC response letter with little or no editing. Dan or I will work directly with these individuals to complete the letters. Conflicts or other issues will be the responsibility of the responsible agency member to attempt to resolve. If an issue needs to be discussed among a broader audience, then that can be handled on a case-by-case basis.  
The responsible individuals for each agency are as follows:
  - a. WSDOT preparation of the letter – Jason Smith and/or Dan Hagglund
  - b. Ecology – Kim Harper
  - c. KC DDES – Doug Dobkins
  - d. USACE – Kate Stenberg
  - e. WDFW – Jim Fraser
2. The following format is provided to assist in organizing comment. This format will generally be used to organize agency responses within the EPC letters. (See example)
  - a. Agency Name.
  - b. Specific Permit Application Needs: These should be needs unique to the project or your agency jurisdiction. Items already covered in the JARPA, MAP Team checklist, or standard practices do not need to be reiterated within the letter unless the project is non-typical with regard to standard MAP Team member agency guidance. (i.e. USACE Talent issues, specialized project data such as non-typical hydrologic data for a mitigation site, etc.)
  - c. Comments should be organized by resource area or project activity. (i.e. Wetlands, Water Quality, Wetlands Mitigation, Culvert Design, etc.)
  - d. Please make your comments brief and concise.
    - i. Keep any overviews short and to the point. If you need an introduction to help define your agency role or other reasons, place it right after your agency name.
    - ii. Please specify if the comment represents a perceived risk or opportunity for the project based on your organizations requirements and/or your personal observations. If you have any suggestions, please reference them as briefly as possible. If the subject is too complicated to be briefly summarized, provide an invitation for the design team to work with you to develop solutions.
    - iii. Comments need to be grounded in the respective agency regulation or policies.
3. Comments should be provided to the designated agency individual within five working days of the EPC meeting. The collective agency response should be forwarded to Jason or Dan within seven working days of the meeting. The goal is to have the completed EPC letter adequately reviewed by the team and sent to the PEC within ten-fifteen working days of the EPC meeting. To avoid problems with inadequate or slow distribution, WSDOT MAP Team Personnel will send the EPC letter in electronic and hard copy form to the PEC, PE and all other relevant personnel within the specified time periods as is appropriate.

Sample of the format and process extracted from the SR 9, Nooksack to Cherry Street EPC Letter:

**Ecology -**  
Stormwater Management:

22. We understand that WSDOT is planning to use the 1995 Highway Runoff Manual as amended by Instruction Letter (IL-4020.2) for design and treatment of stormwater on this project. However, recent correspondence between WSDOT and Ecology concludes that projects that go to Ad after June 2005 will be required to use the new 2004 HRM. The projected Ad date for this contract is October 2005. Therefore, it appears that stormwater design for this project should be based on the new 2004 HRM, unless exceptions are approved for specific projects, such as this one, with Ad dates close to the June 2005 deadline. This would occur at an administrative level above that of the MAP Team.
23. WSDOT is proposing to use dispersion to treat and discharge stormwater on this project. The Ecology stormwater unit has developed a draft design guidance document for stormwater treatment using dispersion. This document may be useful in helping to guide your design, but it is not required for use, is still in draft form and is subject to revision. The draft guidance document is attached.
24. Given the existing site conditions and soil type, it will be difficult to treat all of the site discharge using dispersion as the primary treatment and flow control alternative. Conditions for this treatment alternative include: 1) the depth to average annual maximum groundwater elevation be at least three feet, 2) the dispersion area be planted with native trees and shrubs, and 3) the dispersion area be 6.5 times larger than the paved area. Dispersion on WSDOT right-of-way looks reasonable with adequate soil design (type C & D soils will need to be amended to adjust the organic content), but dispersing flows into the adjacent farm fields looks unworkable given the requirements for planting and a lower water table than exists at the site. This suggests that partial treatment by dispersion coupled with other methods will be needed for stormwater treatment and detention on this project.
25. If the project parameters do not allow full compliance with the appropriate manual, WSDOT should concentrate on maximizing flow control and treatment BMP's on the new pavement areas closest to Bone Creek. Local Ecology staff (Bellingham Field Office) concurs with WSDOT observations that this area drains slowly, and they indicated that the flow regimes in Bone Creek should be held as closely to pre-development conditions as possible. Please inform MAP Team staff as early as possible if the appropriate manual requirements cannot be met for this project.